

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 33-90 are all the claims pending in the application, of which claims 65-90 are withdrawn. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 41-43, 48 and 58.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 33-37, 39, 40, 51, 58-62, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Yoshio et al. (JP 04-310631, hereinafter “Yoshio”).

Independent claim 1 is amended to define “a processor,” as at least discussed at page 5, lines 25 to 31 and page 6, lines 18 to 23 of the filed specification, and 1 recites:

A receiver adapted to receive data contained in a transmitted broadcast signal, the receiver comprising:

a processor that processes a received broadcast signal including data, stores the data as a database in a memory, provides a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus, selects data from the database in response to the accepted selections and provides the selected data in digital form, and converts the selected data from digital form to an analog signal.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yoshio does not disclose or suggest a “receiver” including “a processor that processes a received broadcast signal...stores the data as a database in a memory, provides a user interface...selects data from the database...and converts the selected data,” as recited in claim 1. Instead, as made clear by the certified, second translation of Yoshio, Yoshio discloses a system including (1) an information provider (broadcasting station), (2) a receiver and optical disk recording device, and (3) a portable optical display playback device (separate from the receiver) (*see e.g.*, 2nd Translation of Yoshio, ¶¶ 9-10). There is no teaching or suggestion that the receiver in Yoshio includes a processor that “stores the data as a database in a memory, provides a user interface...selects data from the database...and converts

the selected data,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, at best, the receiver in Yoshio is merely a base station for receiving signals. There is no teaching or suggestion that the receiver includes a processor storing “data as a database in a memory,” providing “a user interface,” selecting “data from the database,” and converting “the selected data.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Yoshio fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Yoshio for at least these reasons.

To the extent that independent claim 58, as at least discussed at page 5, lines 9 to 14 of the filed specification, recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 58 also would not have been anticipated by Yoshio for at least reasons similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

Claims 1, 33-37, 45, 49, and 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Browne et al. (WO 92/22983, hereinafter “Browne”).

Independent claim 1 is amended to define “a processor,” as at least discussed at page 5, lines 25 to 31 and page 6, lines 18 to 23 of the filed specification, and 1 recites:

A receiver adapted to receive data contained in a transmitted broadcast signal, the receiver comprising:

a processor that processes a received broadcast signal including data, stores the data as a database in a memory, provides a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus, selects data from the database in response to the accepted selections and provides the selected data in digital form, and converts the selected data from digital form to an analog signal.

Applicant respectfully submits that Browne does not disclose or suggest a “receiver” including “a processor that processes a received broadcast signal...stores the data as a database in a memory, provides a user interface...selects data from the database...and converts the

selected data,” as recited in claim 1. Instead, Browne only discloses a controller 105 that stores incoming programming in a FIFO queue 104c of a storage section 104. In Browne, the “memory is cycled because the FIFO buffer 104c causes only selected desired programming to be stored in storage section 104 (see Browne, p. 7, l. 33 - p. 8, l. 5; *see also*, Browne, p. 10, l. 30 - p. 11, l. 11, p. 13, ll. 1-17, p. 18, l. 29 - p. 19, l. 30). There is no teaching or suggestion that the controller 105 stores programming in the storage section 104 “as a database” and “selects data from the database.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Browne fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Browne for at least these reasons.

To the extent that independent claim 58, as at least discussed at page 5, lines 9 to 14 of the filed specification, recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 58 also would not have been anticipated by Browne for at least reasons similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 38, 41-44, 52, 54-56, 67, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshio in view of De Bey (WO 99/03112). Claims 45-50, 57, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshio in view of Official Notice. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshio in view of De Bey, and further in view of Official Notice. Claims 1, 33-44, 52, 54-56, 58-62, 67, 69, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Yoshio. Claims 45-50, 53, 57, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over De Bey in view

of Yoshio, and further in view of Official Notice. Claims 1, 33-37, 49, 52, 54-56, 58-61, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lang (U.S. Patent 5,057,932) in view of Yoshio. Claims 38, 41, 42, 67, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lang in view of Yoshio, and further in view of Rovira (WO 92/10040). Claims 39, 40, 45-48, 50, 51, 53, 57, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lang in view of Yoshio, and further in view of Official Notice. Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lang in view of Yoshio and Rovira, and further in view of De Bey. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshio in view of Ryan (U.S. Patent 5,590,195). Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Yoshio, and further in view of Ryan. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yoshio in view of Myers et al. (U.S. Patent 5,272,752, hereinafter “Myers”). Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Yoshio, and further in view of Myers. Claims 38 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of De Bey. Claims 39, 52-54, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of De Bey, and further in view of Official Notice. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of Yoshio. Claims 40 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Brown in view of Guenther et al. (U.S. Patent 5,086,510, hereinafter “Guenther”). Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of Benbassat et al. (U.S. Patent 4,700,322, hereinafter “Benbassat”).

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of Whitby et al. (GB 2258102, hereinafter “Whitby”). Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne et al. in view of Date (“An Introduction to Database Systems”). Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of De Bey, and further in view of Yoshio. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Brown in view of Official Notice. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Browne in view of Ryan. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Brown in view of Myers.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references to De Bey, Official Notice, Lang, Rovira, Myers, Guenther, Benbassat, Whitby, and Date fail to cure the deficient disclosures of Yoshio and Browne. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 33-64 are patentable over the various cited combinations of references.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Attorney Docket No.: Q116830

Application No.: 08/977,846

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Christopher J. Bezak
Registration No. 63,241

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 16, 2010